

Appl. No. 09/941,313

Attorney Docket No. 10541-451

II. Remarks

Reconsideration and re-examination of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is herein respectfully requested.

After entering this amendment, claims 1-10 remain pending.

Examiner Interview

Interviews with the examiner were held on July 26, 2007 and August 16, 2007. During the first interview, the primary examiner, supervisory examiner and the undersigned discussed if U.S. Patent No. 6,222,503 to Gietema, et al. ("Gietema") discloses a transmitter located within a lamp chamber. It is the position of the undersigned that Gietema does not disclose a transmitter located within a lamp chamber because Gietema only discloses that the transmitter is located within the pole like piece portion of the street lamp and not within the lamp chamber of the street lamp. After the interview, the examiner still maintained his position. The examiner did note that Gietema could be overcome if claim 1 was amended to substantially recite, "there is no barrier between the transmitter and the light source."

During the second interview, the undersigned asked the examiner if Gietema could be overcome by amending claim 1 to substantially recite, "there is no barrier between the transmitter and the lens." The examiner preliminarily indicated that this amendment would overcome Gietema. Therefore, claim 1 has been amended to recite that there is "an unobstructed space between the transmitter and the lens."



BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
PO Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60611-5599

- 4 -

Appl. No. 09/941,313

Attorney Docket No. 10541-451

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 3-6, and 8-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0012389 to Brice, et al. ("Brice") in view of Gietema. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The examiner contends that Brice discloses an automobile audio system that comprises a transmitter, connected to one of a plurality of audio sources, and a plurality of receivers that receive audio signals broadcasted throughout the automobile by said transmitter. Additionally, the examiner states that Brice discloses that the automobile may be a car and that it is inherent that the car comprises a passenger compartment as well as a lamp assembly affixed to the roof of said passenger compartment, said lamp assembly comprising a lens and housing as well as a light source connected to a power source.

However, by the examiners own admission, Brice does not disclose the placement of transmitters in a lamp assembly, the connection of the transmitters to the audio source and the transmitters adapted to receive information from analog or digital audio source. For these features, the examiner cites Gietema, which the examiner believes discloses a system for concealing antenna systems in a lamp chamber and that the antennas of Gietema transmit the audio information through the lens of the lamp chamber.

A careful reading Gietema will reveal that Gietema discloses the concealment an antenna within a pole like object or shaft, not a lamp chamber. (Column 4, lines 28-30; column 6, lines 62-65; column 7, lines 52-

BRINKS
HOFER
GILSON
& LIONE

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
PO Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60611-5599

- 5 -

Appl. No. 09/941,313

Attorney Docket No. 10541-451

59). Figure 1b of Gietema discloses an antenna 13 located within a pole of a lamp. Additionally, Figure 1b also shows that a radome 6 (containing a satellite dish or horn dish) can be located above the pole or above the lamp itself (but not inside the lamp chamber itself). (Column 12, lines 35-37).

Claim 1 recites of a transmitter located within the lamp chamber, the transmitter adapted to transmit signals through the lens of the lamp chamber. Gietema only discloses a radome 6 that can be located either above the pole of the lamp or above the lamp itself (column 12, lines 35-37). Unlike as required by claim 1, Gietema does not disclose placing the transmitter within the lamp chamber.

Additionally, Gietema does not disclose that the transmitter is adapted to transmit signals through the lens of the lamp chamber. Since the radome 6 contains a satellite dish or a horn dish, any transmitted signals emitted by the enclosed satellite dish or horn dish are transmitted upward, towards an orbiting satellite. Lamps, especially street lamps, are adapted to project visible light downward to the ground. A lens is located beneath the lamp to allow light emitted by the lamp to radiate downward, while also protecting the lamp from environmental harm. Since the radome 6 of Gietema emits signals upwards and away from the lens, it is submitted that Gietema does not disclose the element of a transmitter being adapted to transmit signals through the lens of the chamber.

Finally, claim 1 has been amended to recite that there is an unobstructed space between the transmitter and the lens. As discussed previously with the examiner, the transmitter of Gietema is located within the

BRINKS
HOFER
GILSON
& LIONE

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
PO Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60611-5599

- 6 -

Appl. No. 09/941,313

Attorney Docket No. 10541-451

pole piece of the street lamp and not within the lamp chamber. Because of this positioning, there are a significant number of components, and other barriers, located between the transmitter and the lens.

In that neither Brice or Gietema disclose or suggest (1) a transmitter located within a lamp chamber, (2) the transmitter being adapted to transmit signals through the lens of the lamp chamber or (3) that there is no barrier between the transmitter and the lens, it must be concluded that the combination of Brice in view of Gietema cannot render the claims of the present application as obvious. The rejection under § 103 is therefore improper and should be withdrawn.


With respect to the remaining claims, these claims are dependent on claim 1 and are patentable for at least the same reasons as given above in support of claim 1. Accordingly, allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present form of the claims are patentably distinguishable over the art of record and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Such action is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

August 20, 2007
Date


John A. Lingl (Reg. No. 57,414)



BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
PO Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60611-5599

- 7 -